MEETING HIGHLIGHTS
Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group
Management Council

June 16, 1999
EESB – Snoqualmie Room
8:15 a.m. – 12:00 noon

PURPOSE

- To continue discussions regarding the EM R&D Program Plan; specifically, to discuss the value of roadmapping and ownership of the EM Corporate Performance Measures.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lloyd announced that we worked off-line to endorse the NABIR letter. Comments from Ecology were incorporated, and the letter was sent to HQ.

Shannon presented the purpose of the meeting and reviewed the agenda

UPDATES

- Technology Update – RPL Facility
  John Lafemina, PNNL, presented information on the mission and scope of the Radioprocessing Laboratory (RPL). A tour of the facility was offered.

- Recommendations for MC Endorsement – Changes to STCG Management Plan
  Discussion was held on the proposed changes to the STCG Management Plan. The endorsement vote was taken and passed unanimously. Several editorial changes will be made.

- S&T Needs Status – FDH is in the process of final editing. The final report will be put on a CD-ROM disk and distributed by late August. Shortly after that, it will be put on the web site.

- Subgroup Oral Reports – Subgroup leads talked about activities being done in the Subgroups.

VALUE OF ROADMAPPING

Kelli Templeton, PNNL, presented the status of roadmapping. The problem area roadmaps have been completed, and two project-level roadmaps have been developed: Cesium Removal for SRS HLW and Hanford Vadose Zone. The value of roadmapping was discussed, and suggestions were made on potential STCG roles in Site roadmaps.

SITE OWNERSHIP OF EM CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Julie Erickson, RL, presented information on the proposed EM Corporate Performance Measures. The four measures are:

- Meet high-priority needs
- Reduce the cost of EM's major cost centers
- Reduce EM's technological risk
- Accelerate technology deployment

There were many comments and suggestions on what and how we should be measuring performance. It was suggested that an ad hoc committee be formed to discuss the issues and develop draft recommendations for HQ, which can be sent to STCG members off-line for endorsement.

PLANS FOR WGA WORKSHOP

Gary Ballew, PREC, said the primary goal of this workshop is to increase the dialog among all the parties. Since this workshop overlaps our July STCG Management Council meeting, it was suggested that we cancel our next meeting so members can attend the workshop.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

A list of strategic issues for future agendas was handed out. Members were requested to mark which of these items they would really like to discuss. Comments will be tallied and the results used to help plan future meetings. Results are attached.

MEETING REVIEW/WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be held on August 18, 1999, from 8:15 a.m. to 12:00 noon, in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

ACTIONS

- Ad Hoc Committee will prepare recommended STCG comments to HQ on EM Corporate Performance Measures for members to endorse off-line.

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

June 16, 1999
EESB – Snoqualmie Room
8:15 a.m. – 12:00 noon

INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lloyd announced that we worked off-line to endorse the NABIR letter. Comments from Ecology were incorporated, and the letter was sent to HQ.

Additional Congressional hearings on EM-50 were held with the GAO and corporate people from Bechtel and FDH. To summarize, progress was made, but more is needed. The hearings were certainly not as negative as the hearings a couple of years ago. Gerald Boyd is still working hard on going forward with his initiatives.

The annual Baseline Updating Guidance is ready to go out. TIPs are emphasized again. The STCG Subgroups should take a look at it to make sure everything gets fully reflected in the baselines.

The cleanup budget for FY 2000 is up $60-70M dollars over the President's budget. Funds have been added for Hanford-specific items. Indications are that we should have increased funding at the Site.

Shannon presented the purpose of the meeting and reviewed the agenda.

UPDATES

Technology Update -- RPL Facility Presentation
John Lafemina, PNNL

There is a perception at the Site that the Radioprocessing Laboratory (RPL, 325 Building) is still stuck in 1995 with operational problems. The fact is that it was reorganized in 1997, and all the staff are now under a single management responsible for all operations in the facility.

The RPL is one of PNNL's three strategic R&D facilities, including APEL & EMSL. It is the only Category II nuclear facility. The RPL Mission is to create and implement innovative processes for environmental cleanup and the beneficial use of radioactive materials.

The RPL has grown significantly in the last few years, mostly because of increased support to Hanford Site cleanup: ORP, BNFL privatization, PFP cleanup, K-basins spent fuel and sludge, and EM national programs. RPL staff want to be involved in actual cleanup as well as S&T.

John invited the group to tour the facility so they could see for themselves the work being done. He also asked for comments on the RPL mission. Their web site is located at the following address: http://w3.pnl.gov/facops2/325/index.htm

Nancy Uziemblo asked where most of their funding comes from. John said that 65% of their funding comes from EM (95% of this amount comes from Hanford contractors), mostly for laboratory testing.

Craig Richins commented that the greatest resource at RPL is "wise minds and practiced people". It is a tremendous resource. He thinks they have an intricate role in Hanford Site cleanup. They also produce pharmaceutical-grade medical isotopes that meet FDA approval. John added that one example of a unique capability is making use of their inert atmosphere glove boxes. The RPL contains heavy-duty hot cells that compare favorably to others at the Site.

Recommendations for MC Endorsement

Discussion was held on the proposed changes to the STCG Management Plan. There were several editorial changes and typos that were identified and will be incorporated. Lloyd gave guidance on how to include the Office of River Protection (ORP). We should use "DOE Hanford" when it is truly Site-wide, and "ORP" and "RL" for the appropriate organizations at Hanford. Those changes will also be made to the Management Plan. Another change that will be incorporated is the Subgroup name change, from "Decontamination and Decommissioning" to "Deactivation and Decommissioning". It was also noted that Jay Augustenborg is now the core member for Waste Management, with Beth Bilson the designated alternate.

The endorsement vote was taken, and it passed unanimously.

Yes	9
No	0
Abstain	0

S&T Needs Status

Greg Berlin, FDH, reported that they have completed the crosswalk tables telling which needs have been added or revised. They are now in the process of final editing. The final report will be put on a CD-ROM disk and distributed by late August. It will look fairly similar to what was done last year.

Nancy Uziemblo requested that it also be put on the web site. Terry Walton said that right now they are focused on the CD; shortly after that it will be on the web site, probably by the end of August.

Lloyd asked what the process was if people want to add new S&T needs. Greg said that they needed to have a cutoff point for the report, but will take new needs at any time.

Nancy Uziemblo asked what the HQ due date was for the S&T needs. Shannon said that there was no guidance from HQ; our timing matches our Site's schedule (MYWP, etc). We will be moving it up a little next year.
Nancy asked when the funding would be allocated to the needs. Most of the proposals get their funding in October. There are opportunities throughout the year for others to be funded.

Subgroup Oral Reports

Tank Subgroup – No report

Subcon Subgroup – Fred Serier – Recent actions in the Subcon Subgroup include:

- Endorsed and submitted 13 short-form TTPs (proposals) to SCFA
    - Three are continuations from last year.
    - Discussed the short lead time for TTP preparation. To alleviate the burden, we discussed the development of a schedule for preparation of long-form TTPs.
    - Reviewed short-form TTPs on June 10-11. There is a favorable response for about 8 of the proposals.
- ISRM Peer Review by EPA Region X
    - Result: Hanford should proceed with the technology deployment.
- ITRD: The next meeting is June 17-18 to narrow the list of potential technologies.
- Status of Hydrogen Sulfide Demonstration/Deployment
    - Successfully demonstrated at White Sands
    - Currently refining a short list of sites for demonstration at Hanford
- Endorsed the S&T needs

D&D Subgroup – Dave Langstaff – Paul Pak is acting co-chair while Jim Goodenough is on another assignment.

- The S&T needs were endorsed. They are improving their process; specifically, there was more effort in making sure the loop was closed between the DOE and contractor project people.
- The D&D Subgroup is involved in two ASTD projects - the robot work platform to be deployed in 324 Building, and working with the Nevada Test Site looking for further applications for laser decontamination throughout the Complex.
- Dave Langstaff went to the D&D Focus Area mid-year review.

Mixed Waste Subgroup – Ellen Dagan – The line organization is coming to FDH Technology Management for needs based on the M-91 milestone. A proposal for disposal of long-length equipment was discussed.

VALUE OF ROADMAPPING
Kelli Templeton, PNNL

Kelli is part of the EM Roadmapping Core Team. She defined roadmapping as a process for understanding where you are, where you want to go, and how to get there. Robert Galvin of Motorola defined a roadmap as "an extended look at the future of a chosen field of inquiry composed from the collective knowledge and imagination of the brightest drivers of change in that field".

At DOE-HQ, Undersecretary Moniz is looking for a framework for DOE's diverse R&D program to ensure that it is justified, integrated, and complete. The roadmapping process is being implemented across DOE/EM. Problem area roadmaps have been completed, and two roadmaps have been developed at the project level: Cesium Removal for SRS HLW and Hanford Vadose Zone.

Project-level roadmaps are the cleanup project manager's determination of the S&T investments needed to help ensure the success of the cleanup project/activity. A proposed list of projects to be roadmapped has been developed and the Program Area Integration Team (PAIT) is reviewing it. There are 26 initial candidates for project-level roadmapping, and some of these would be managed at Hanford. The STCG can provide comments as to which projects should prepare roadmaps.

The value added by roadmapping is as follows:

- Roadmapping gives the cleanup project manager more control over S&T investments.
- EM will align and optimize the S&T investment portfolio by identifying both gaps in the current program and activities that do not support the line programs.

Questions/Comments:

Linda Bauer gave a testimonial on the Hanford Vadose Zone S&T roadmap. She said it is an excellent tool to understand the gaps and timing to come up with TIPs. Congressional staff on Capitol Hill really like the roadmap. It is a good communications tool and an essential planning tool.

Kelli indicated that funding for development of the roadmaps is in question. Gerald Boyd feels that the sites need to own and pay for the roadmaps. The Core Team is pushing for shared funding, which will help entice the sites. Idaho is doing a Complex-wide roadmap for the vadose zone. The STCG can help identify which roadmaps need to be done here at Hanford. To find out who is on the PAIT for Hanford, go to the EMI home page. Dave Evans represents Deactivation and Ron Gerton represents Subcon (ER).

Dave Langstaff said the projects should be solicited to see if they want to do the roadmaps; then the STCG would endorse them. Who is going to take the information to the projects?

Lloyd said that it is a project issue. They have to decide if they want to use their resources to develop a roadmap.

Linda Bauer said we should provide feedback to HQ that they should not be prescriptive and tell us what projects to roadmap. They should put out guidance to help the projects make decisions. She thinks they would find it helpful to know about the roadmaps, but they don't want a formal wicket to go through.

Billie Mauss added that it helps to have something formally written down on long-term needs.

Nancy Uziemblo said that the success of the vadose zone roadmap is that a big audience (like the STCG) was involved early. The projects need to invite the same type of audience to be involved in other roadmaps. Invitees could come from the STCG Management Council.

Terry Walton said that roadmapping is a good project management activity to involve the regulators and stakeholders. We need a driver to make it happen.

Dave Langstaff said that the real focus of roadmapping is the process. The final report is just a record of the process.

<u>Summary of Potential STCG Roles in Site Roadmaps:</u>

- Selection of projects to develop roadmaps – Should be project-driven. AMs should solicit interest among their projects. Tell HQ not to be prescriptive and tell us what projects to roadmap; just provide guidance.

- Participation in roadmapping process – Involve regulators and stakeholders (i.e., STCG membership).
- Endorsement of finished roadmaps
- Tracking status of roadmapping efforts

SITE OWNERSHIP OF EM CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MEASURES
Julie Erickson, DOE-RL

There are four suggested EM corporate performance measures:
- Meet high-priority needs
- Reduce the cost of EM's major cost centers
- Reduce EM's technological risk
- Accelerate technology deployment

The sites are going to be asked to report against these performance measures, so we need to be involved. The Paths to Closure data will be used for tracking the performance measures.

Points to consider include:
- Are the measures driving desired behaviors?
- Are the measures measuring the effectiveness of ongoing work at the Site?
- Are the measures tied to project outcomes?

Historically, S&T measures have been output measures:
- Science needs met
- Demonstrations initiated
- Numbers of deployments

Second-generation S&T measures are assistance measures:
- Costs reduced
- Schedules advanced
- Risks abated

These measures may still not change the behavior or measure the outcome that we want.

Next-generation measures should be outcome-driven measures:
- Leading
    - Baselines available
    - Technology insertion points defined
    - Alternative analyzed
    - Alternatives funded
    - Regulatory acceptance achieved
- Lagging
    - Waste dispositioned
    - Land remediated
    - Buildings decommissioned

Comments recorded on flipcharts:

- Keep measures general and capture items like safety.
- Measure using roadmaps and gauge other indicators using them.
- Keep in mind projects that are not roadmapped.
- How can we capture Focus Area successes?
- Understanding and qualifying risk may be key. Need to understand uncertainty, not just track but invest in mitigation.
- Ground-tested (make sure these measures will work).
- Let line programs defend S&T.
- Identify leading indicators for cost savings to ensure we have the data when needed.
- What does the curve look like for #2 and #3 of high-priority needs?
- Cautious as to how we capture life-cycle data.
- Fear of cost savings being taken away.
- Need to understand how. What does high-priority mean?
- Keep it simple.
- How is the Focus Area prioritizing our needs (differences in "high")?
- How do you truly meet a need across the Complex?
- Deployment does not tell anything about value.
- Add improvement on safety.
- Measure overall impact.
- Need to compare number of deployments to number of technologies funded.
- Increase speed of cleanup.
- Better connections between projects
- Qualitative measures should be considered and balanced with quantitative measures.
- How many times has the technology been deployed?
- Put a letter together on our recommendations
- What is it that is important for the Site to know?
- Need more input for HQ.
- STCGs should be scoring the Focus Areas.

Other comments:

We need to compare to the baseline. Is there improvement in cost, safety, or process? If not, why are we doing this?

Rick Brouns noted that all the leading indicators are missing. Should be a measure of all the projects that have peer-reviewed roadmaps. Independent review of project baselines; maybe first step is to look at baselines.

Lloyd Piper: Is the high-priority needs measure intended to solely be a site measure? HQ is going to get the information from the Paths to Closure data (e.g., from the high-priority needs on the list, how many have we taken off?) Should there be a different set of measures for the Focus Areas?

Terry Walton: Cost/benefit tracking – we don't have an answer for that yet. Baselines don't have that level of detail. You have to go find it. Want to be cautious about how we use life-cycle costing. Technical support (may be tied to risk) -- Should take this down to the project level (ground troop it) -- if they don't have the information, don't pick it as a measure.

Terry Walton: We should let the line programs defend the S&T Program.

Dave Langstaff: Cost savings -- is this projected or actual cost savings? Should establish leading indicators so you can easily identify significant savings and cost avoidance.

Julie Erickson: Having the process in place to collect the data should not be a leading indicator.

Billie Mauss: Is it still a problem that the projects are afraid to identify cost savings because they think their budget would get reduced?

Are these the right things that we should be measuring?

Dave Langstaff: Meeting high-priority needs is a nice concept. How is it going to happen?

Terry Walton: This sounds like a Focus Area measure that is Complex-wide, not specific to Hanford.

Linda Bauer: "Increase technology value through deployment" does not tell her anything.
Important to capture safety and health benefits.

Nancy Uziemblo: Reduce cleanup cost -- needs to be considered, but need to add in safety, etc.

Dave Langstaff -- Number of technologies deployed should be compared with number of technologies funded. If you can provide a connection with technologies funded to the projects, you may be able to increase the numbers of technologies deployed.

Billie Mauss: The number of technologies used is not as good a measure as the number of uses of the same technology.

Shannon Saget: There hasn't been an official request for field input yet, but we know that they want it. Does the STCG want to provide input?

Rick Brouns: We should write a letter stating our suggestions and comments (all the ideas collected on the flipcharts).

Randy LaBarge (PNNL) – He is developing a Site-wide balanced scorecard for DOE-RL/PID. Is there some other group besides the STCG that is looking at this issue? There is a real opportunity for us to have impact on this. Look at what's important for the managers here on Site to know, and then propose those for measures. Need to provide a list of suggested measures, rather than just make comments on theirs.

Billie Mauss: The STCG could feed back to the Focus Areas on how well they are meeting the high-priority needs.

It was decided to form an ad-hoc committee to follow this through. They will prepare draft recommendations to HQ and will poll STCG members off-line to gain endorsement. Committee members are Terry Walton, Jerry White, Nancy Uziemblo, Dave Langstaff, and Craig Richins.

PLANS FOR WGA WORKSHOP
Gary Ballew, Pacific Rim Enterprise Center (filling in for Michael Jacobson)

The primary goal of this workshop is to increase the dialog among all the parties. On Day 1, there will be two educational case study panels - Contract Reform and Regulatory Flexibility. The morning of Day 2 will be a brainstorming session. A Hanford tour is scheduled for the afternoon of Day 2.

Nancy Uziemblo added that workshop participants would discuss many of the topics/issues we have discussed over the last year in the STCG meetings. She suggested we cancel our STCG meeting so members can attend the WGA Workshop.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

A list of strategic issues for future agendas was handed out. Members were requested to mark which of these items they would really like to discuss. Comments will be tallied and the results used to help plan future meetings.

MEETING REVIEW/WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be held on August 18, 1999, from 8:15 a.m. to 12:00 noon, in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

ACTIONS

- Ad Hoc Committee will prepare recommended STCG comments to HQ on EM Corporate Performance Measures for members to endorse off-line.

STRATEGIC ISSUES FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

5	How to get funding to the Site in a timely manner (follow-up on STCG letter of endorsement for the S&T Workshop results)
4	We need to understand the implications of having Idaho as a lead site, because a lot of funding is going there. Hanford's "fair share" is dropping and we need to understand why. *
4	What if the BNFL vitrification program doesn't get funded? We must have some sort of ongoing study for what we will do if the present vitrification contract doesn't go through to completion. Understanding the consequences of leaving all or some of the waste in place in the tanks is very important (e.g., using the empty tanks as some sort of long-term storage).
4	Integration of technology into Site baseline, budget, and schedule (TIPs)
4	CDI —Canyon volume for immobilized waste storage vs. empty tank volume. Should we store immobilized waste in the tanks (like Oak Ridge does) instead of in canyons?
3	How do ITRD and TechCon activities factor into the decision process related to the baseline? *
3	Understanding the interface between the Focus Areas and EM-50 and the integration activities across EMI and the PAITs. *
3	EM-50 is now using a new prioritization system and has some criteria. We might want to examine their criteria or definitions, as they may affect our funding.
3	How we get significant industry input to the Site and how to replicate it.
2	Endorsement of "processes" for Subgroup activities
2	Barriers to technology deployment **
2	How is EM-50 Focus Area management working or not working for us? We need to understand the concepts. *
1	STCG Role in Environmental Management Integration (EMI)
1	"Blue sky" thinking about technology issues
1	NRC report —technology needs should be based on project endstates.
1	R&D Program Plan —There is money in science and in technology deployment, with not much in between. We need to understand where our needs fit and if there is money in those areas. If our needs don't match the plan, we need to tell Gerald Boyd. *
	A number of reports are talking about the effectiveness of the cleanup program and technology supporting it. In order to measure the success of a technology, our projects must have baselines that progress can be measured against.

* One person suggested that the items with asterisks be accomplished by DOE-STP covering the topic in a report to the STCG. Another person said "no" —there are too many reports to read.

** Workshop on July 20 will tackle this.